After having spent much time analyzing this, I've determined which factors enabled me to love you.

I projected a personality, which I consider to be virtuous, delusionally onto you. For the same reason, I ignored the many things which I fundamentally hate about you. I was deluding myself.

I am heavily emotionally susceptible to environments. Most of my social contact was through those players. All of them are typical detestable humans, and it bred an aura of innumerable negative emotions for me. You were a respite from that.

You could actually type coherently. Relationships cannot exist if communication is not present, which would immediately preclude me from being able to have a relationship with 99% of the humans there. I don't believe it's a coincidence that the only other person I liked at all was Soresu, who usually types coherently. If I had spoken to him more often, I might have loved him. Once every month or so in that game, I would meet someone who would type properly, and I would always try to play with them. I remember one person in particular whom I followed around only because he typed properly, which allowed me to communicate with him without feeling as if I was dealing with a severely mentally handicapped duck. He spoke disrespectfully of his girlfriend the first day I spoke to him, which would normally serve as the catalyst for my detestment of such a person, yet I completely overlooked it because I was so relieved to be able to speak with someone who was in any way capable of communicating.

Relationships have absolutely no physical aspect to me: all that matters is communication. The nature of the internet fosters this.

I incessantly have nothing other than scorn for humanity. I have been desperate to feel anything positive for someone for my entire life.

Early on, you referenced serial killing multiple times in ways people normally don't. That immediately appealed to me.

I have an affinity for people whom I perceive as being abused, and consummate scorn for the abusers. It was probably the primary enabling factor. The way you are relentlessly treated by these humans is obscenely offensive to me, so everytime they would do it, it would simultaneously increase my sympathy for you and increase my resentment for all of them. My wrath for them fostered more of a negative atmosphere, which would cause you to be even more of a respite from their depravity. It was self-perpetuating.

I'm capable of boundless affection. I had never been in a sitation to feel that way before, so I thought that it was special.

I took my focus away from myself and directed it toward you.

Because I used to be hate-filled and couldn't just dismiss people I didn't like. It tore me apart, and I needed someone who didn't.

Coercion is endemic to parenting in general. Children are slaves to their parents' will in virtually every family.

You're a Christian. Religion, being cultural, inherently subjugates.

That whole "dishonor" fatuity. Something is "dishonorable" not because it lacks virtue, but because it goes against their "authority". All they're doing is imposing their will on you.

You submit to the notion of culture, which your parents forced onto you.

-You often made reference to the ways genders should behave.
-You celebrate holidays.
-You derogatively said that C_Redfield was "whitewashed" because his Vietnamese pronunciation was poor as if that was an issue. Vietnamese culture is equally as pathetic as American culture is. The entire notion of culture is pathetic. You believing that he should be able to speak Vietnamese merely because that's what his father did is absurd.

You saying that I shouldn't disassociate myself from my parents- that I need to change the way I think about them. I had never spoken about my parents prior to that, so you had no knowledge about them. Saying what you did would necessitate all parents inherently being virtuous, which is not true. The reason you believe that is because the culture your family forced onto you virtually diefies familial elders.

When your sister was angry at your mother, allegedly over a haircut. It had nothing to do with the haircut; she was angry about other issues.

I'm certain that I would be a phenomonal father because I would foster a free environment for my child. S/he would never do anything "because I said so". Instead of treating her/him like a pet that can talk, I would treat her/him like a little person who doesn't know very much. I would not subject my child to my opinions: I would encourage them to think for her/himself

If you believe that you understand me, then I should be able to verify that through asking you some questions and seeing your answers.

Why did I love you?

Why do I feel nothing other than negativity toward you?

What comes to mind when I make the statement "Vietnamese culture is deplorable."?

What gender am I?

Why did I not ___ on July 18th?

What political ideology do I find most plausible?

Why am I an atheist?

Why will I never drink anything alcoholic?

What would my parenting style be?

Why is it that the only time you've spoken to me while I've been angry (enough so that my heart rate was approximately 150 even though I had been doing nothing other than sitting) was when they were making sexual derisions about you?

What is wrong with being mentally deficient and such? People say that discrimination based on skin color is wrong because they are not actually inferior, but what is wrong with inferiority? Why should they be discriminated against just because they are inferior?

You're a Christian?

Why are you a Christian?

How did you come across the information you know about Christianity?

How do you know that the information you received is true?

How is that distinct from the basis other religions use to claim their legitimacy?

How do you know that you are correct in your religious beliefs and that people of other religions are wrong?

If you had been born into an Islamic family in Iran, would you still be a Christian if you came across the information about Christianity?

Is it possible that you're wrong?

It's like you're beginning with the proposition "There are magical little people."

One group says "The magical little people are gnomes."
Another group says "The magical little people are leprechauns."

What basis is there for believing that there are magical little people at all?

Is it really love if you're not willing to romantically love a male the same way you would a female?
Why do I take my scorn for certain individuals and apply it to humanity in general?
Figure out why "rape is about power" in relation to the institutions of families and states.
~HMM... If people were not conditioned into believing that rape is traumatic, rapists wouldn't have "power"!

She needs to be contemplative, introverted, introspective, insubordinate, non-confrontational, able to

communicate with me, and engage in banter. And I think I want her to be at least vegetarian.

Sometime, check your honesty while speaking to someone.

Hair in the front was awkwardly wavy while the sides were relatively straight.
Some acne was prominent
My head was turned slightly to the right. That's most visible with my nose and larynx.
I was awkwardly smirking because I was told to smile. I shouldn't have done anything.
I was paying too much attention to my hair and didn't notice my eyebrows, which would have taken a second to fix.

4/16 Italian
3/16 Irish
3/16 English
2/16 French-Canadian

4/16 ? "Wilkinson", Scandinavian.

What is wrong with culture?

It restricts free thought.
It inflicts arbitrary prejudiced perspectives onto people.
It dimisses the differences between individuals to contrive an artifical group, to which people are coerced into submission.
It enables baseless bigotry between other arbitrary cultural groups and cohesion among people in the group for which there is no reason to associate.
It causes people to suffer through the arbitrary perspectives.

Why do I oppose religion, as distinct from culture?

It is cultural.
It requires actions and encourages types of behavior which are based on delusions which don't have any basis in reality. Happiness is increased by rationally evaluating the world and modifying your behavior. The more delusional you are, the less you're able to be happy.
It conflates morality with the religion.

How to be pale:

Always be covered as well as possible and avoid the sun
Always use sunscreen
Wash your skin thoroughly and exfoliate
Reduce blood pressure
Donate blood every two months

Why not vote for the lesser of two evils?:

Voting is a false sense of control.
Authoritarian governments, operating under the presumption of being free, force compulsory voting.
What if no one voted? The lower the voter turnout, the more of a message it sends.
My single vote doesn't make a difference. I would have to organize an incredibly large group of people who also are not voting for this reason, with all of us agreeing to vote.
Getting involved with politics is meaningless.
It can easily be sabotaged, anyway.

What kind of people go to X college?

Engage your imagination to dream vividly.

I step into Socrates's forum and speak to him about happiness. Other philosophers gradually step in.
Plato speaks on behalf of Socrates.
How is happiness attained?
Through moderation.
Moderation of what?
Other philosophers gradually step in.
I refute all of them.
The philosophers bicker.
Toward the end, I say that for all of their philosophizing and such, they can't answer the simplest answer relevant to my life, such as what is good and what is evil. They contradict each other and they contradict themselves.
The philosophers argue angrily, and I watch them. I sit toward an edge and watch, saying that I might eventually be able to make sense out of the loudening clamor.
Einstein shouts from some other building behind the forum, and tells me the definition of insanity.
I ask him how his unified theory is coming along.
Touché.

-PRape

Honestly, doctors touching my penis when I was a child was worse than it would be if I consented to an adult in a loving relationship with them. I don't see how I and every child was not raped by doctors: We did not consent to it. We only did it because our parents made us. Which is another point: If we as a society taught children that they are independent of their parents and that they should not blindly follow them, they would not be abused by their parents in the way they often are. (Tie this into the "Adults enjoy subjugating children" argument?)

Why does "medicinal practice" change the nature of it? An adult touched my genitals when I didn't want them to. Because it "had" to be done and because my parents allowed it fundamentally changes the nature of it?

1.) Why would I be upset over this? Perhaps it because I personally think that the entire notion of "power" and "authority" is pathetic, so I don't feel as if I was "manipulated" (even though by definition, I was; it's just that I don't apply the societal meaning to it).

2.) Why is it okay for a parent to "allow" an adult to touch a child, if they are demonstratably capable of applying reason, just because they're the child's parent? A child should belong to theirself.

I was coerced by an adult into having my penis stroked. This is by definition rape. This happens to virtually every child. Yet everyone thinks there is nothing wrong with this?
It should be up to the child to decide if it is right or wrong.

I was molested at least a dozen times by a few different adults when I was a child. It wasn't my decision at all: I was coerced into it. They felt me all over my body, and it usually culminated in the fondling of my penis. What do each of the adults have in common? They were doctors, and each of them were sanctioned by my parents to do it. This happens to virtually every child without their input into the matter: Their parents sanction it.
And yet, virtually none of these children grow up feeling traumatized by the experience. How can we reconcile this extreme dissonance? Virtually every child's genitals are fondled without their decision in the matter, but when a child deliberately wants to engage in sexual activity with an adult, it becomes traumatic (whether or not they are even cognizant of the "trauma")?

I'm not saying that this is wrong. A child should decide for themself whether they want to allow a doctor to fondle their penis instead of being coerced by their parents into having it done.

It must be because the victims of rape are coerced by their society into believing that what they experienced is an irrevocable evil and a lifelong trauma. And maybe it is to some individuals!

How can we reconcile the fact that virtually every child has been raped and everyone's indifference to it, with the notion that rape is something traumatizing?

I am:
Anticultural
quasi-pacifist
quasi-moral nihilist, although I do not like the term because it gives people the impression that I am not opposed to what is considered immoral.
mutualist anarchist

Morality seems no different than religion to me. The reason why no one can agree on ideal systems of morality and ideal political systems is because all of it is contrived sophistry. It is always an instance of people with power contriving arbitrary ideals to justify actions, or adjusting their actions according to their arbitrary ideals.

Such bizarre instances as "moral agents". It's okay to kill an animal, but it's not okay to kill a human. Killing one person to save many people is wrong, killing one person to save many people is right.

The common factor is that "immoral" behavior is permitted to be treated with force. That's all morality is- the application of force.

These are all completely meaningless bizarre supernatural claims. The truth of the matter is that "morality" is always an instance of a group with power contriving arbitrary ideals to justify their actions, adjusting their actions according to their arbitrary ideals, or whatever.

There are so many ways in which they could be compared. Such as their treatment of suicide.

In conventional Christianity, killing yourself would intuitively be desirable because you would be able to go to heaven. In Buddhism, taking five seconds to kill yourself would free you from a lifetime of suffering. And yet in both, suicide is arbitrarily forbidden for contrived reasons.

The same with morality: Killing yourself would intuitively be moral because you would not have the capacity to commit immoral deeds, which you innately do through being alive; and yet many would somehow forbid suicide as being immoral.

Wars are inevitable

incarceration of nonviolent criminals

economic misuse

miseducation of the young

vote buying

taxes

arms around the world

subsidies

economic inefficiencies

permanent underclasses through ilegal immigrants and welfare

organized crime increase